

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
JUL 16 1945

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. XIII, NO. 316

JULY 15, 1945

In this issue

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON RESULTS OF SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS AFTER WORLD WAR II

By George H. Butler

*For complete contents
see inside cover*



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Vol. XIII • No. 316



PUBLICATION 2360

July 15, 1945

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.

Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

The BULLETIN, published with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The subscription price is \$3.50 a year; a single copy is 10 cents.

Contents

AMERICAN REPUBLICS		Page
Inter-American Relations After World War II. By George H. Butler	88	[Rel
EUROPE		
Bastille Day—Symbol of Freedom. Statement by the President	83	TO
Policy Toward New Government in Italy. Letter From Acting Secretary Grew to Acting Chair- man Johnson	87	Sir: T tion 25th Eur war Chi men beer tota foug four
FAR EAST		
Concerning Japanese Peace Offers. Statement by Acting Secretary Grew	84	wou
Sinking of the "Awa Maru"	85	dea
CULTURAL COOPERATION		
Philologist To Visit in Brazil	83	men
Visit of Venezuelan Dentist	100	num
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS		
Sugar Shipments to Spain	100	trie
THE UNITED NATIONS		
Summary of Report on Results of San Francisco Conference	77	and shop mon
TREATY INFORMATION		
Food-Production Agreement. Venezuela	99	valu
Exchange of Ratifications of Treaty of Friendship. China—Costa Rica	99	ble
Inter-American Conventions. Peru	100	cost
Cooperative Education. El Salvador	100	spin
THE DEPARTMENT		
International Information Division	100	the
Appointment of Officers	101	T
THE CONGRESS		
	101	fer sen cost of in sev the mil ing had had sen

AUG 6 '45

Summary of Report on Results of San Francisco Conference¹

[Released to the press by the White House July 9]

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

June 26, 1945

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

SIR:

The United Nations Conference on International Organization met in San Francisco on the 25th day of April, 1945. At that time the war in Europe had lasted for more than five years; the war in the Pacific for more than three; the war in China for almost eight. Casualties of a million men, dead, wounded, captured, and missing had been suffered by the United States alone. The total military casualties of the nations which had fought the European war were estimated at some fourteen millions dead and forty-five millions wounded or captured without count of the civilian dead and maimed and missing—a multitude of men, women, and children greater than the whole number of inhabitants of many populous countries. The destruction among them all of houses and the furniture of houses, of factories, schools, shops, cities, churches, libraries, works of art, monuments of the past, reached inexpressible values. Of the destruction of other and less tangible things, it is not possible to speak in terms of cost—families scattered by the war, minds and spirits broken, work interrupted, years lost from the lives of a generation.

Thirty years before the San Francisco Conference was called, many of the nations represented there had fought another war of which the cost in destruction had been less only than that of the present conflict. Total military casualties in the war of 1914-1918 were estimated at thirty-seven million men. Counting enemy dead with the dead among the Allies, and civilian losses with military losses, over thirteen million human beings, together with a great part of the work they had accomplished and the possessions they owned, had been destroyed. Many of the nations represented at San Francisco had fought the second war

still weakened by the wounds they suffered in the first. Many had lost the best of two succeeding generations of young men.

It was to prevent a third recurrence of this great disaster that the Conference of the United Nations was called in San Francisco according to the plans which Mr. Cordell Hull as Secretary of State had nurtured to fruition. The Conference had one purpose and one purpose only: to draft the charter of an international organization through which the nations of the world might work together in their common hope for peace. It was not a new or an untried endeavor. Again and again in the course of history men who have suffered war have tried to make an end of war. Twenty-six years before the San Francisco Conference met, the Conference of Paris, under the inspired and courageous leadership of Woodrow Wilson, wrote the Covenant of a League of Nations which many believed would serve to keep the peace. That labor did not gain the wide support it needed to succeed.

But the Conference at San Francisco, though it was called upon to undertake a task which no previous international conference or meeting had accomplished, met nevertheless with high hope for the work it had to do. It did not expect—certainly no member of the American Delegation expected—that a final and definitive solution of the problem of war would be evolved. Members of the Conference realized, from the first day, that an evil which had killed some forty million human beings, armed and unarmed, within the period of thirty years, and which, before that, had ravaged the world again and again, from the beginning of history, would not be eradicated by the mere act of writing a charter, however well designed.

¹ This letter from Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to President Truman appears in *Charter of the United Nations: Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference by the Chairman of the United States Delegation, the Secretary of State* (Department of State publication 2349, Conference Series 71), pp. 9-19. The letter is printed separately as Department of State publication 2355, Conference Series 72.

Nevertheless, the Conference at San Francisco had behind it the demonstrated capacity of its members to work together to a degree rarely if ever before attained by sovereign nations. Not only in the prosecution of a war fought on four continents and the waters and islands of every ocean under conditions of the greatest danger and difficulty, but in the preparation for the termination of the war and, more particularly, in the preparation for the organization of the post-war world to keep the peace, the principal Allies had established a working and workable collaboration without precedent in the history of warfare. At Moscow in 1943, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and China had made a pledge which still endures, to continue their united action "for the organization and maintenance of peace and security". At Dumbarton Oaks, these four Allies had reached agreement upon proposals for a world security organization, and later at Yalta, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had further extended the area of their common understanding to which China gave her full adherence. These proposals, immediately published for the criticisms and comments of the people of all the United Nations, became the basis of the work at San Francisco.

Furthermore, there was reason, in the nature of the San Francisco Conference itself, to hope that

more could be accomplished there than had been possible at earlier meetings. The Conference called at San Francisco was not a peace-time conference summoned to debate the theory of international cooperation, or a post-war conference convened to agree upon a treaty. It was a war-time conference. Every nation represented at San Francisco was in a state of war when the Conference began. Many were engaged throughout the weeks of its deliberation in bitter and costly fighting. Not only the peoples of the United Nations but the more than sixty million men and women enlisted still in the armed forces of those nations regarded the Conference, and had a right to regard it, as a meeting of *their* representatives engaged upon a labor of immediate importance and concern to *them*. It was a peoples' conference and a soldiers' conference in the sense that it met under the eyes of the soldiers who fought this war and the peoples who endured it, as no previous conference to deal with peace and war had ever met. It was a conference, also, which met in a world which knew of its own knowledge that another war would be fought, if there were another war, with weapons capable of reaching every part of the earth—that similar weapons had indeed been brought to the point of use in the present conflict.

These facts exerted a compelling influence not only on the work of the Conference but on the Charter it evolved. It was the common and equal determination of all those who participated in its labors that the Conference *must* reach agreement: that a charter must be written. The possibility of failure was never at any time admitted. It was the determination of the delegates, also, that the Charter which the Conference produced should be a charter which would attempt to meet and to satisfy the concern and the anxiety of those who had suffered war and who knew at first hand the realities of violence. It would be a charter which would combine, with a declaration of united purpose to preserve the peace, a realistic and suitable machinery to give that purpose practical effect.

The Charter drafted by the Conference at San Francisco is such a charter. Its outstanding characteristic and the key to its construction is its dual quality as declaration and as constitution. As declaration it constitutes a binding agreement by the signatory nations to work together for peaceful ends and to adhere to certain standards of international morality. As constitution it creates four overall instruments by which these ends may

Charter of the United Nations Together With the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Signed at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, California, June 26, 1945. Department of State publication 2353, Conference Series 74. 62 pp. Free.

This pamphlet includes the texts of the Charter and of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and a chart of the Organization of the United Nations.

Interim Arrangements Concluded by the Governments Represented at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, California, June 26, 1945, Department of State publication 2357, Conference Series 75. 4 pp. Free.

Copies of these publications may be obtained by writing the Department of State, Division of Research and Publication, Washington 25, D.C.

be achieved in practice and these standards actually maintained. The first function of the Charter is moral and idealistic: the second realistic and practical. Men and women who have lived through war are not ashamed, as other generations sometimes are, to declare the depth and the idealism of their attachment to the cause of peace. But neither are they ashamed to recognize the realities of force and power which war has forced them to see and to endure.

As declaration the Charter commits the United Nations to the maintenance of "international peace and security", to the development of "friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples", and to the achievement of "international cooperation in solving international problems", together with the promotion and encouragement of "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all". More precisely, the United Nations agree to promote "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

Further, in its capacity as declaration, the Charter states the principles which its Members accept as binding. "Sovereign equality" of the member states is declared to be the foundation of their association with each other. Fulfillment in good faith of the obligations of the member states is pledged "in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership" in the Organization. Members are to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and in such manner as not to endanger international peace and security, and justice. Members are to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations". At the same time Members bind themselves to give the Organization "every assistance in any action it takes" in accordance with the Charter, and to "refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action".

The United Nations Charter as Declaration and as Constitution: A Letter to the President From Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Chairman of the United States Delegation to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. San Francisco, California, June 26, 1945. Department of State publication 2355, Conference Series 72. 16 pp. Free.

In his letter to the President Mr. Stettinius describes the duties and functions of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and the Court as the four "principal tools through which, and by which, the general aims and purposes of the Charter would be carried out".

Addressing President Truman, Mr. Stettinius has written:

"Upon the belief that the Charter as Constitution will furnish effective means for the realization of the purposes fixed by the Charter as Declaration; and upon the belief that the Charter as Declaration will set noble and enduring goals for the work of the Charter as Constitution, I base my firm conviction that the adoption of the Charter is in the best interests of the United States and of the world. . . . every word, every sentence, every paragraph of the Charter's text was examined and reconsidered by the representatives of fifty nations and much of it reworked. For the first time in the history of the world, the world's peoples directly, and through their governments, collaborated in the drafting of an international constitution. What has resulted is a human document . . . [which] offers the world an instrument by which a real beginning may be made upon the work of peace."

Copies of this publication may be obtained by writing the Department of State, Division of Research and Publication, Washington 25, D.C.

Finally, the Charter as declaration binds those of its Members having responsibilities for administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained the full measure of self-government, to recognize the principle "that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount" and to "accept as a sacred trust" the obligation to promote their well-being to the utmost.

These declarations of purposes and principles are notable in themselves. They state, without condition or qualification, a first and overriding purpose "to maintain international peace and security". International peace and security are the essential conditions of the world increasingly free from fear and free from want which President

Roosevelt conceived as the great goal and final objective of the United Nations in this war and for the realization of which he and Cordell Hull worked unceasingly through twelve of the most decisive years of history.

But neither these declarations, nor those others which assert the intention of the United Nations to bring about the economic and social conditions essential to an enduring peace, or to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, would suffice, in and of themselves, to meet the evil of war and the fear of war which the Conference at San Francisco was called to consider. What was needed, as the Charter itself declares, was machinery to give effect to the purpose to maintain the peace—"effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace". What was needed, if the United Nations were really determined to have peace, was the means to peace—"to bring about by peaceful means . . . adjustment or settlement of international disputes".

These means the Charter in its capacity as constitution undertakes to establish. It creates, in addition to its Secretariat and the Trusteeship Council with its specialized but vital functions, four principal overall instruments to arm its purposes and to accomplish its ends: an enforcement agency; a forum for discussion and debate; a social and economic institute through which the learning and the knowledge of the world may be brought to bear upon its common problems; an international court in which justiciable cases may be heard. The first is called the Security Council; the second, the General Assembly; the third, the Economic and Social Council; the fourth, the International Court of Justice. Their functions are the functions appropriate to their names.

It will be the duty of the Security Council, supported by the pledged participation, and backed by military contingents to be made available by the member states, to use its great prestige to bring about by peaceful means the adjustment or the settlement of international disputes. Should these means fail, it is its duty, as it has the power, to take whatever measures are necessary, including measures of force, to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. It will be the duty of the Security Council, in other words, to make good the commitment of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, turning that lofty purpose

into practice. To that end the Council will be given the use and the support of diplomatic, economic and military tools and weapons in the control of the United Nations.

It will be the responsibility of the General Assembly to discuss, debate, reveal, expose, lay open—to perform, that is to say, the healthful and ventilating functions of a free deliberative body, without the right or duty to enact or legislate. The General Assembly may take up any matter within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided in the Charter. It may discuss the maintenance of peace and security and make recommendations on that subject to the Security Council calling its attention to situations likely to endanger peace. It may initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the maintenance of peace and security. It is charged with the duty of assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms and encouraging the development and codification of international law. It may debate any situation, regardless of origin, which it thinks likely to impair the general welfare, and recommend measures for its peaceful adjustment. It may receive and consider reports from the various organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council.

Stated in terms of the purposes and principles of the Charter, in other words, it is the function of the General Assembly, with its free discussion and its equal votes, to realize in fact the "sovereign equality" of the member states to which the United Nations are committed and to develop in practice the "friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" which the chapter on Purposes names as its second objective. Furthermore, it is the function of the Assembly to realize in its own deliberations the "international cooperation in the solution of international problems" which the Charter recites as one of its principal aims, and to employ the weapon of its public debates, and the prestige of its recommendations, to promote and encourage "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms".

The relation of the Economic and Social Council to the stated purposes of the United Nations is similarly direct and functional. The attainment of the ends which the United Nations lists among its Purposes in economic, social, health and other

related fields, requires expert knowledge and careful study and the development of collaborative programs of action. The instrument devised by the Charter to that end is a Council in the economic and social field acting under the general responsibility of the Assembly and consisting of representatives of eighteen states.

The Economic and Social Council is empowered to make and initiate studies in its field, to frame reports and to make recommendations on its own initiative not only to the General Assembly, but to the Members of the Organization and to the specialized agencies in the fields of economics, health, culture, labor, trade, finance, human rights, and the like, which will be associated with the United Nations under the Council's coordination. Furthermore, the Council is authorized to call international conferences "on matters falling within its competence"; to prepare, for submission to the General Assembly, "draft conventions" in this field; "to perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations and at the request of specialized agencies"; and to obtain reports from the member states and from the specialized agencies on steps taken to give effect to its recommendations and those of the General Assembly. In a field of interest which concerns the peoples of the world as directly as the field of social and cultural and economic improvement, the power to study, report and recommend—the power to call conferences, prepare draft conventions and require reports of progress—is a power which can be counted on to go a long way toward translating humanitarian aspirations into human gains.

The role of the International Court of Justice in the realization of the objectives of the Charter is obvious from the general nature of the Court. The purposes of the Charter include the adjustment or settlement of international disputes "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law". The International Court of Justice is the instrument of the United Nations to effect this purpose in the case of justiciable disputes referred to the Court by the parties. Where disputes are referred to the Court, or where member states accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in certain categories of cases, its decisions are, of course, binding upon the parties. Moreover, under the Charter, all members of the United Nations undertake to comply with the decisions of the Court. Where a party to a case decided by the

Court fails to comply with its decision, the matter may be brought to the attention of the Security Council for appropriate action.

These four overall instruments of international action constitute the principal means by which the Charter proposes to translate the world's hope for peace and security into the beginning of a world practice of peace and security. There are other instruments, adapted to other and more special ends. There is the Trusteeship Council, which will have the heavy responsibility of attaining in non-

Charter of the United Nations: Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference by the Chairman of the United States Delegation, the Secretary of State, June 28, 1945. Department of State publication 2349, Conference Series 71. 266 pp. 45¢.

Mr. Stettinius reports on the Charter of the United Nations, section by section: preamble; purposes and principles of the Organization; membership; organs—the General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. Related topics are the pacific settlement of disputes; actions with respect to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression; regional arrangements; international economic and social cooperation through the Economic and Social Council; dependent territories and arrangements for trusteeship; and the miscellaneous provisions, as well as the transitional security arrangements, amendments, ratification and signature, and the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations. These topics are discussed and interpreted in comparison with the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and against the provisions of the League of Nations Covenant. The historic growth of the United Nations is reflected in the mention of international gatherings—from the Hague Conferences to Yalta and Mexico City.

The participation of the United States as a sponsoring power and a member nation is stressed in the Report, which is 156 pages long. Five appendices include parallel texts of the Charter and the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals with a key to comparison; texts of the Statute of the International Court of Justice; the Interim Arrangements Concluded by the Governments Represented at the United Nations Conference on International Organization; List of Delegations and the United States Delegates; and chart of the Organization of the United Nations.

Copies of this publication may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

strategic areas the objectives of the trusteeship system established by the Charter. There is the Secretariat which, as an international civil service responsible to the Organization alone, will constitute its staff. The Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Court are, however, the principal tools through which, and by which, the general aims and purposes of the Charter would be carried out.

They are instruments admittedly of limited powers. The jurisdiction of the Court is not compulsory unless accepted as such by member states. The Assembly cannot legislate but merely discuss and recommend. The Security Council is obliged, when force is used, to act through military contingents supplied by the member states. Measured against the magnitude of the task to which the United Nations have committed themselves and considered in the light of the long history of previous failures in this undertaking, such limited instruments may seem inadequate to the labor to be done. They have, nevertheless, characteristics which justify a greater hope for their success than the extent of the powers delegated to them would imply. They have behind them the history of humanity's long effort to suppress, in other areas of life, disorder and anarchy and the rule of violence. These four instruments are, in effect, the four principal agencies through which mankind has achieved the establishment of order and security as between individuals and families and communities.

On the frontiers of democratic society—not least upon the American frontiers—the instruments of order have always been, in one form or another, an agency to enforce respect for law with moral and physical power to prevent and to suppress breaches of the peace; a court in which the differences and disagreements of the citizens could be heard and tried; and a meeting place where the moral sense of the community could be expressed and its judgments formed, whether as declarations of law or as declarations of opinion. To these three fundamental and essential instruments of order, time and the necessities of advancing civilization have added a fourth institution through which technical knowledge and accumulated experience can be brought to bear upon the social and economic problems of society—problems with which learning and science and experience can effectively deal.

These four fundamental instruments—the enforcement officer, the Court, the public meeting, and the center of science and of knowledge—are instruments to which free men are accustomed. They are instruments in the use of which self-governing men have become adept over many generations. They are instruments the efficacy of which has been demonstrated by the whole history of human civilization. Their establishment in the international world, though accompanied by limitations upon their scope, will not alter their quality nor diminish their prestige. To transplant vines and trees from familiar to unfamiliar environments, is necessarily to cut them back and prune them. To transplant social organisms from the world of individual and group relations to the world of international relations, is necessarily also to limit them and cut them back. Nevertheless, instruments of proven social value taken over from the domestic to the international world carry with them qualities of vigor and of fruitfulness which the limitations placed upon them by their new condition cannot kill. They have behind them an historical momentum and a demonstrated usefulness which mean far more, in terms of ultimate effectiveness, than the precise legal terms by which they are established in their new environment.

Moreover, if the work of cutting back is done realistically, the chances of survival are increased. The four social instruments taken over by the United Nations have been adapted to the conditions of the actual world of international relationship with a realistic appreciation of the limiting factors to be faced. The Security Council is not the enforcement agency of a world state, since world opinion will not accept the surrender of sovereignty which the establishment of a world state would demand. The Security Council, therefore, depends upon the sovereign member states for the weapons both of persuasion and of force through which it will attempt to keep the peace. But its dependence upon the member states is realistically adapted to the situation of the member states. The Council is to use the power of the member states in accordance with the realities of the distribution of power. The voting procedure of the Security Council is expressive of the actualities of the possession and the exercise of power in the modern world. The five principal military powers of our time are made permanent members of the Council. Furthermore, in order that their

possession of power and their use of power may be made to serve the purpose of peace, it is provided that they shall exercise their power only in agreement with each other and not in disagreement.

A similarly realistic acceptance of the facts of the actual world limits the General Assembly to discussion and deliberation without the power to legislate, since the power to legislate would necessarily encroach upon the sovereign independence of the member states. So too the Economic and Social Council has no power or right to interfere with the domestic affairs of the states composing the United Nations. And for the same reason the jurisdiction of the Court is limited. These adaptations to the realities of the existing situation in the contemporary world do not decrease, but on the contrary increase, the likelihood that the instruments borrowed by the Charter of the United Nations from the history of the ancient struggle for peace and order among individual men will serve their purpose in the newer struggle for peace and order among nations.

Upon the belief that the Charter as Constitution will furnish effective means for the realization of the purposes fixed by the Charter as Declaration; and upon the belief that the Charter as Declaration will set noble and enduring goals for the work of the Charter as Constitution, I base my firm conviction that the adoption of the Charter is in the best interests of the United States and of the world.

If we are earnestly determined, as I believe we are, that the innumerable dead of two great holocausts shall not have died in vain, we must act in concert with the other nations of the world to bring about the peace for which these dead gave up their lives. The Charter of the United Nations is the product of such concerted action. Its purpose is the maintenance of peace. It offers means for the achievement of that purpose. If the means are inadequate to the task they must perform, time will reveal their inadequacy as time will provide, also, the opportunity to amend them. The proposals of the Sponsoring Powers on which the Charter is based were published to the world six months before the Conference to consider them convened. In these six months the opinion of the world was brought to bear upon their elements. Subsequently, at the Conference itself, every word, every sentence, every paragraph of the Charter's

text was examined and reconsidered by the representatives of fifty nations and much of it reworked. For the first time in the history of the world, the world's peoples directly, and through their governments, collaborated in the drafting of an international constitution. What has resulted is a human document with human imperfections but with human hopes and human victory as well. But whatever its present imperfections, the Charter of the United Nations, as it was written by the Conference of San Francisco, offers the world an instrument by which a real beginning may be made upon the work of peace. I most respectfully submit that neither we nor any other people can or should refuse participation in the common task.

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

Bastille Day— Symbol of Freedom

Statement by THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House July 14]

In Bastille Day the people of France have given the world an undying symbol of freedom. Throughout the long history of our friendship with France the people of the United States have shared the principles for which it stands. Never have those principles had a greater significance than in this year of the final overthrow of one of the darkest tyrannies that have ever tried to enslave mankind.

Philologist To Visit in Brazil

[Released to the press July 11]

Dr. Carlo Rossi, professor at the University of San Francisco, and author of the recently published work, *Portuguese: the Language of Brazil*, will carry on specialized philological studies in Brazil for the next 10 months. The research project is sponsored by the Department of State. It is Dr. Rossi's second visit to Brazil, where he gave a series of lectures at six universities in 1943. His present tour of travel and observation will take him to all sections of the country.

Dr. Rossi's new book, published in May of the current year, is a basic text for a two-year course in Portuguese, with vocabulary based on the language as spoken in Brazil.

Concerning Japanese Peace Offers

Statement by ACTING SECRETARY GREW

[Released to the press July 10]

The situation today is exactly the same as it was on June 29 when I made my last statement on this subject.¹ We have received no peace offer from the Japanese Government, either through official or unofficial channels. Conversations relating to peace have been reported to the Department from various parts of the world, but in no case has an approach been made to this Government, directly or indirectly, by a person who could establish his authority to speak for the Japanese Government, and in no case has an offer of surrender been made. In no case has this Government been presented with a statement purporting to define the basis upon which the Japanese Government would be prepared to conclude peace.

The alleged "peace feelers" have invariably been inquiries as to our position. On one occasion, "leading Japanese industrialists" were reported as wanting to know the best possible conditions the Allies would advance for a compromise peace. On another occasion, the representative in Tokyo of a neutral government reported that he had been told by a private Japanese individual that the Japanese could not accept unconditional surrender because it would mean loss of face. On still another occasion a member of the staff of the Japanese mission to a neutral country intimated to an American citizen through a German newspaperman that real American interests in the Far East should lead the United States to abandon unconditional surrender and propose terms for a negotiated peace.

Finally, an unidentified person approached an American mission in a neutral country, claiming that he had been authorized (by whom was not indicated) to approach the government of the neutral country with a view to persuading the Allies to drop unconditional surrender and to propose terms.

¹ The statement referred to in this release was issued on June 29, 1945 by Acting Secretary Grew for the correspondents in lieu of his press and radio news conference. On that date Mr. Grew said that this Government had received no peace offers from the Japanese Government either through official or unofficial channels.

² BULLETIN of Oct. 29, 1944, p. 495.

It should be borne in mind in this connection that the Japanese, like the Germans before them, rely principally upon the hope that they may be able to divide the Allies and to produce division of opinion within the Allied countries. To that end, it would be to their interest, as they see their interest, to initiate a public discussion of the terms to be applied to Japan. This they have already attempted to do on several occasions through Radio Tokyo.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that "peace feelers" are familiar weapons of psychological warfare and will be used as such by the Japanese, particularly now that their military position is deteriorating and the condition of their civilian population becomes more critical. I pointed out in a speech on Navy Day a year ago,² on October 27, 1944, that efforts would undoubtedly be made by the Japanese to sow dissatisfaction between the Allies and even among our own people. In that speech I said:

"I wish to take this important occasion to repeat, with all possible force, the warning which I have continually tried, all over the country, to drill home into the consciousness of our people, namely, that we must not, under any circumstances, accept a compromise peace with Japan, no matter how alluring such a peace may be or how desirous we may become of ending this terrible conflict. An enticing peace offer may come from Japan at any time. The facts of the situation are beginning to seep into the consciousness of the Japanese people. Some of them—perhaps only a few at the present time, but the number will grow steadily—know beyond peradventure that they are going to be defeated. . . . Before the complete ruin of Japan, these men are almost certain to make an attempt to save something from the wreckage. . . . They would probably offer to withdraw their troops from the occupied areas and return those areas to their former status. They might even offer to give up their control of their puppet state in Manchuria. All this they might offer to do if only we would agree to leave their homeland free of further attack. . . ."

"Should that moment come, America, the United Nations, would be put to a most severe test. The temptation to call it a day might be stronger than we can now visualize. That, my friends, would be the moment to fear, not for ourselves but for our sons and grandsons, lest they should have to fight this dreadful war over again in the next generation. For assuredly, if we should allow ourselves to relax before carrying to completion our present determination to render the Japanese impotent ever again to threaten world peace, that would be the fate of our descendants. That cancerous growth of Japanese militarism would follow the example of the German war-machine after 1918—perpetuate itself and prepare Japan again for some future Armageddon. I have no fears as to the nature of our decision, so long as our people fully understand the dangers of a premature and compromise peace, but let us be warned in time."

The nature of the purported "peace feelers" must be clear to everyone. They are the usual moves in the conduct of psychological warfare by a defeated enemy. No thinking American, recalling Pearl Harbor, Wake, Manila, Japanese ruthless aggression elsewhere, will give them credence.

Sinking of the "Awa Maru"

[Released to the press July 14]

The Government of the United States has now completed its investigation of the circumstances surrounding the sinking by an American submarine of the Japanese vessel, *Awa Maru*, while returning, under safe-conduct, from a voyage to Hong Kong, Singapore, and other ports to carry supplies for Allied prisoners of war and civilian internees in Japanese custody.

The investigation discloses that the *Awa Maru* was substantially complying with all conditions of the safe-conduct agreement. In the circumstances the burden of making positive identification was placed upon the United States submarine. The investigation reveals that the United States was responsible for the sinking of the *Awa Maru*. The Government of the United States has acknowledged responsibility to the Japanese Government through the Swiss Government in a telegram dated June 29, 1945, and suggested that, in

Japanese militarism must and will be crushed. The policy of this Government has been, is, and will continue to be unconditional surrender. Unconditional surrender does not mean, as the President pointed out in his message of June 1, 1945, the destruction or enslavement of the Japanese people.¹ The President stated this very specifically on May 8, when he said in answer to the question "Just what does the unconditional surrender of the armed forces mean for the Japanese people?":

"It means the end of the war.

"It means the termination of the influence of the military leaders who have brought Japan to the present brink of disaster.

"It means provision for the return of soldiers and sailors to their families, their farms, their jobs.

"It means not prolonging the present agony and suffering of the Japanese in the vain hope of victory."²

The policy of this Government has been, is, and will continue to be unconditional surrender as defined by the President in these statements. That is the best comment I can make upon peace feelers and rumors of peace feelers of whatever origin.

view of the complex nature of the question of indemnity demanded by the Japanese, this matter be deferred until the end of the war.

On April 11, 1945, the Department of State announced that it had been informed by the Navy Department that the Japanese vessel, *Awa Maru*, traveling under Allied safe-conduct had been sunk by submarine action.³

On May 29, 1945, the Department released the text of a Japanese protest dated April 26 as well as the text of this Government's reply dated May 18.⁴ In this reply, this Government notified the Japanese Government that an investigation was then in progress to assemble all the relevant information on the sinking and notified the Japanese Government that the United States Govern-

¹ BULLETIN of June 3, 1945, p. 1006.

² BULLETIN of May 13, 1945, p. 886.

³ BULLETIN of Apr. 15, 1945, p. 692.

⁴ BULLETIN of June 3, 1945, p. 1033.

ment could not accept, prior to the judicial determination of the question of responsibility, the charge of the Japanese Government that responsibility for the disaster lay with the United States Government.

On May 16, 1945 (received May 30), the Japanese Government formally demanded that the United States Government apologize to the Japanese Government for the sinking; punish those responsible; and indemnify the Japanese Government for the loss incurred.

The text of the Japanese statement dated May 16, 1945, transmitted through the Swiss Government, is as follows:

"With reference to the protest which the Japanese Government lodged with the United States Government through the Swiss Government under the date of the 26th of April against attacking and sinking of the *Awa Maru*, the Japanese Government while reserving all rights not hereby exercised to take any necessary action to cope with this violation of a solemn undertaking, make the following demands and request the United States Government to inform the Japanese Government without delay whether they are prepared promptly to comply with the same. Namely (one) that the United States Government apologize to the Japanese Government; (two) that the United States Government punish persons responsible and inform the Japanese Government thereof; (three) that the United States Government pay indemnities for the loss of lives of the crew and the passengers for the injury done to the survivors and for the loss of the vessel and of the goods which were on board.

"The Japanese Government by their note of 12th April addressed to Swiss Minister in Tokyo requested the United States Government to inform them fully of the circumstances in which the *Awa Maru* was attacked and sunk and to take adequate measures for the repatriation of the survivors at the earliest possible date. The Japanese Government request an early reply."

The text of this Government's communication of June 29 follows:

"The Japanese Government's further communication dated May 16 concerning the sinking of the *Awa Maru* has been received by the United States Government, which makes the following responses to the points raised therein:

"(1) The United States Government, in its communications forwarded through the Swiss Government dated April 10 and May 18, 1945, has already officially expressed its deep regret that this incident has occurred and that there was such a heavy loss of life in connection therewith.

"The official investigation into this disaster has now been concluded. It has been established that at the time the ship was sunk she was proceeding at night in a fog. There is, however, evidence that she was showing the prescribed lights. It appears that the ship was about eight miles off the course previously announced and was about 32 miles ahead of her predicted position. However, the difference between the ship's predicted position and the scene of the disaster is not considered unreasonable. The Commanding Officer of the submarine did not see the *Awa Maru* prior to or after she had been torpedoed, the attack having been made by means other than visual, which fact of itself disproves the charge that the attack was willful and deliberate. However, since it appears that the *Awa Maru* was complying substantially with the conditions of the safe-conduct agreement, the burden of establishing identity was that of the commander of the American submarine and in view of his failure to do so, the United States Government acknowledges responsibility for the sinking of the vessel.

"(2) Disciplinary action is being taken with respect to the commander of the American submarine concerned.

"(3) Because of the complex nature of the question of indemnity, this aspect of the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily during the period of hostilities. It is suggested, therefore, that the matter of indemnity be deferred until the termination of hostilities. The Japanese Government may be assured that the United States Government will be prepared at that time to discuss all phases of the question of indemnity and will approach the question with an attitude of complete fairness and without regard to the political situation then existing.

"The survivor of the sinking, who is now being cared for by American authorities, will be repatriated to Japan as soon as arrangements are perfected for further exchanges of nationals between Japan and the Allies."

In taking this action the United States Government not only took into consideration the facts as

determined by the investigation but was also guided by the very real necessity of doing everything in its power to insure that future shipments of food, clothing, and medical supplies to Allied prisoners of war and civilian internees in Japanese custody would be facilitated by the Japanese Government.

Ever since the outbreak of the war in the Pacific, the Government of the United States with the other interested governments has made every effort to maintain a flow of essential relief supplies to Allied individuals in Japanese custody to supplement the inadequate supplies being furnished them. During 1942 and 1943 in connection with the exchange operations some relief supplies were sent in.

In 1944 there were no exchanges. However, the United States Government, deeply conscious of its responsibility to these unfortunate individuals, actively continued negotiations through the Swiss Government with a view to working out mutually satisfactory arrangements for the delivery by the Japanese of further relief supplies. These negotiations finally resulted in an arrangement whereby, through the cooperation of the Soviet authorities, such supplies were picked up at Nakhodka by a Japanese vessel. This vessel traveled under safe-conduct granted by this Government on behalf of itself and the other Allied governments. A portion of the shipment was distributed to American and other Allied prisoners of war and civilian internees in Japan. Subsequently the Japanese asked for and received safe-conduct for two vessels, one to proceed to Shanghai to carry a portion of the remainder of the supplies for prisoners of war in that area and the other to proceed to the southern areas (Hong Kong, Singapore, et cetera) for a similar purpose. The vessel despatched to Shanghai completed its voyage. The other vessel, the *Awa Maru*, after carrying supplies for distribution to the southern areas, was sunk on its return trip to Japan.

The United States Government in accepting the responsibility for the sinking of the *Awa Maru* hopes that the Japanese Government will be willing to accept further shipments of relief supplies for distribution to Allied nationals detained by the Japanese.

¹ H. Rept. 881. Mr. Johnson is Acting Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

² BULLETIN of June 3, 1945, p. 1006.

Policy Toward New Government in Italy

LETTER FROM ACTING SECRETARY GREW
TO ACTING CHAIRMAN JOHNSON¹

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 23, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I refer to your letter of May 25, 1945, requesting the Department's comments on the joint resolutions introduced by Mr. Marcantonio, House Joint Resolution 204 and House Joint Resolution 205, which was acknowledged in my letter of May 31, 1945.

House Joint Resolution 205 requests the President to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally. Inasmuch as this Government has no alliances outside of its ties with the United Nations, to recognize Italy as a "full and equal ally" could only mean permitting her to become one of the United Nations. This step, however, is covered by House Joint Resolution 204 requesting the President to use his good offices "to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement of January 1942."

This Government's policy has been to encourage the new democratic Italy to regain full membership in the international community. Much progress has already been made, as witnessed by our present formal diplomatic relations with that country, and it is hoped that further progress will be made, especially now that all Italy has been liberated. You may be interested in the statement I made to the press concerning our Italian policy on May 31, a copy of which is attached for your convenience.² I believe that the spirit of the resolutions in question is in keeping with the spirit of our policy as expressed in that statement.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

The Honorable LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

Inter-American Relations After World War II

By

GEORGE H. BUTLER¹

THIS ARTICLE has grown out of a series of personal notes and exchanges of correspondence with officers in the Department in connection with political reporting. An effort is made to project the observations made in the article against the developments of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, held at Mexico City during February and March of this year, and of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, which has just been concluded at San Francisco. However, since there has not been time for a thorough analysis of the work of the two Conferences, the proper perspective naturally is lacking.

The personal notes are based primarily upon 17 years of Foreign Service experience in the inter-American field—an experience that exerts an influence toward inductive reasoning and pragmatism. It is impossible to give credit where credit is due for part of the material and conclusions set forth. The most stimulating single factor in the writing has been the series of conversations and discussions through the years with Latin American friends, with colleagues in our own and in other foreign services, and with those citizens of our country who take a real interest in the community of nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The opinions expressed are personal ones and do not necessarily reflect Department of State policy.

I

A WORLD CONVULSION of the magnitude of the present one is a turning-point in civilization. All peoples, regardless of the degree of their participation in the struggle, are vitally affected. Important political, social, and economic changes will necessarily follow as a result of universal war. The conflict has some characteristics of a world revolution as well as of a battle among nations. Even under the impact of these tremendous forces, there may not be a complete change in the systems

and conditions which have prevailed in varying forms during the present century. The mighty tide of evolution usually persists against even the most violent currents of revolution. What we may expect are a thorough restudy of many basic problems and a pronounced reorientation of policy relating to some of them.

The relation between world and regional international organizations is one of these basic problems. Both a world system and regional systems have a place in international organizations. The inter-American system as it exists today has been developed over a period of more than half a century. It offers valuable experience, and it serves as a guide in the task of organizing the international community for peace and security.

The American republics deserve great credit for the progress they have made toward finding the means whereby peoples may live together in friendly cooperation and whereby the inevitable conflict of interests may be reconciled without recourse to force. Much remains to be done. It would be fatal to adopt a complacent attitude or to assume that permanent and satisfactory solutions have been found for all basic problems. Measures already adopted must be improved; additional means to achieve the objective must be constantly searched for; and an open mind about making changes—especially fundamental changes—to meet new conditions must be retained.

The problems confronting regional and those confronting world organizations are the same. They fall into three principal categories, although there are no sharp lines of division: *political matters*—those which relate to the science and art of government, to the organization, regulation, and administration of a state, in both its internal and external affairs, and those which pertain to the conduct of all branches of government; *social questions*—those which concern the natural understanding and intercourse of individuals whose lives are distinctly shaped with reference to one another or to the individual in his group relations; and *economic problems*—those that are dealt with

¹ Mr. Butler is Chief of the Division of River Plate Affairs, Office of American Republic Affairs, Department of State.

through the science that investigates conditions and laws affecting the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth, or the material means of satisfying human desires.

Political problems are of vital and pressing importance. Peace and security must be maintained—by the use of all the means at the disposal of international organizations. Limitation on national sovereignty will have to be accepted by all nations in equal degree. Drastic reduction of armaments should be made as rapidly as possible, and all offensive armament except that at the disposal of a world security organization should eventually be eliminated. Real understanding among peoples must be achieved. Freedom of information based on factual and complete reporting of events is essential. Civil liberties and human freedom must be made realities throughout the world.

Social problems, which occupy a middle ground between political and economic problems, involve such questions as employment for all who are able and willing to work, the conditions and wages of labor, land reform programs, public health and sanitation, education, the growth of middle classes, and the possible mass migrations of peoples in many parts of the world.

In the economic field there are such major problems as (1) the means to assure multilateral trade on a universal scale and as free as possible from artificial restrictions; (2) orderly processes for the supply and distribution of many commodities; (3) access to raw materials on equal terms for all countries according to their needs; (4) stabilization of currencies and the means to acquire foreign exchange for trade purposes and for international financial settlements; (5) settlement of intergovernmental debts; and (6) investment of foreign capital.

Almost all of these many problems were considered at the Mexico City and San Francisco conferences. Legislation before the Congress of the United States is directly concerned with some of them. International relations today must be worked out in all of their political, social, and economic aspects. Recent decades have witnessed a disproportionate emphasis upon economic problems. Now we must face frankly and courageously the more important political and social questions. The tragic experiences of this war have taught us again the old lesson that man does not live by bread alone. Food, shelter, and reproduc-

tion are essentials of existence; but life, as a concept of civilization, is much more than mere existence.

A sustained effort should be made after this war to eliminate governments of the totalitarian type, especially the Fascist military dictatorships. That task must be undertaken if peace and security are to be achieved and if disarmament is to become possible. At the same time there must be a renewed and permanent effort to protect civil liberties and the general welfare which were betrayed during the sterile decades from 1919 to 1939. The peoples of the world must address themselves to these tasks through their regional and universal organizations.

II

THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM is well adapted and is sufficiently developed to cope with the common problems of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It should function as an integral part of the world Organization, but Mexico City and San Francisco have clearly demonstrated the strong desire of the American republics to improve further their system and to utilize it to the fullest extent possible. While the world Organization will have responsibility and authority to maintain peace and security, the American republics feel competent to run their own neighborhood affairs. If a situation that threatens world peace or security develops, the Security Council, of course, would have to meet its responsibility by taking such action as it might deem necessary.

There are two sides to the question of the undue authority of the big powers in the world Organization. The text of the Charter of the United Nations states that: "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members."² Also, the preamble starts with the words: "We the peoples of the United Nations". The principle of sovereign equality should be a familiar issue to the people of the United States, since it has run through our national history since the days of the Constitutional Convention. Sovereign equality, yes; but also the greatest good for the greatest number. The peoples of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, China, and continental France account for about 45 percent of the total population of the world and occupy about 28 percent of the land area of the world. If the terri-

² BULLETIN of June 24, 1945, p. 1119.

tories and possessions of the United States, the dominions and other parts of the British Empire, and the French Colonial Empire are added, the population represented is a substantial majority of the total population of the world, occupying more than a half of the land area of the world. From the point of view of majority rule, the five big powers have a strong case. This point was one of the principal issues at the San Francisco conference, and it has a direct bearing on the problem of working out the relation between world and regional organizations.

The procedure of consultation among the governments of the American republics whenever a situation requires study and action is valuable. The setting up of such bodies as the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, the Inter-American Juridical Committee, the Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, the Inter-American Development Commission, and the Inter-American Defense Board marked decided progress in administrative efficiency. Some of these organizations were established to meet the war situation. Others were in existence before the war. The Pan American Union is the central permanent organization of the inter-American system. Changes and improvements to meet new conditions always are essential in any system. One of the principal resolutions of the Mexico City conference provides for the "Reorganization, Consolidation and Strengthening of the Inter-American System".³

One interesting experiment in hemispheric cooperation is illustrated by the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense which has its seat at Montevideo.⁴ The Committee was established pursuant to a resolution adopted at the consultative meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics held at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942. The Governing Board of the Pan American Union was requested to designate a committee of seven members. Although the individual members are appointed by their respective governments, they represent and act in the interest of all the 21 American republics. This procedure could be expanded and adopted for

other operations. A number of small committees might be appointed to deal with special problems. They would act for all 21 nations. Each of the American republics would have representation on one or more such committees, although the membership might not exceed an average of more than six or seven. Such representation would increase the effectiveness of preparatory work for the periodic conferences of American states. The principal task of these conferences should be to pass upon carefully prepared projects. Limited time and the general atmosphere at a large international conference make detailed study and good drafting most difficult.

The periodic American conferences, the consultative meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the committees and commissions in which all of the republics are represented, and the suggested group of small special committees would provide a satisfactory mechanism for handling regional affairs. As a parallel with Government in the United States, the inter-American organization might operate in the field corresponding to that of State governments; functions similar to those of the Federal Government might be performed by the world Organization of which the American republics are members.

International law, arbitration and conciliation, and treaty relations are matters of universal application. It seems unwise for an American system to diverge from general international practice in these and similar respects. Solutions for such problems as those relating to security, disarmament, international air routes, access to raw materials, foreign exchange, and international trade must be on a universal basis. It has proved impossible to deal with these problems on a national or regional basis.

The experience of the war has demonstrated that a firm foundation exists for inter-American solidarity. In spite of differences in national origins, languages, and cultures, a common American point of view prevails. Certain fundamental principles regarding the standards which should govern the international community have been accepted. It has been demonstrated that the American republics will act jointly to resist aggression against any of them by a non-American power; that they will combat activities designed to alter or destroy the freely adopted institutions and principles of the American peoples. Practically all of the American peoples are opposed to

³ For an article on the inter-American system by Dana G. Munro, see *BULLETIN* of Apr. 1, 1945, p. 525; see also "The Inter-American System and a World Organization", address by Assistant Secretary Rockefeller, *BULLETIN* of Apr. 15, 1945, p. 675.

⁴ *BULLETIN* of Jan. 7, 1945, p. 3.

the spread in this hemisphere of the Axis type of totalitarian system. At the same time, the Western Hemisphere cannot live in isolation; it must cooperate with the rest of the world in all fields of human endeavor: no continental rivalries must develop that would bring the disastrous consequences resulting from extreme nationalism and conflict between states. The Western Hemisphere can well afford to seek conciliation of conflicting interests on a basis of give and take.

III

WHEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS face the task of post-war organization, a number of major decisions will be necessary. One of these will concern the question of whether the principle of unanimity or the principle of majority rule is to govern inter-American relations. It seems both unnecessary and Utopian to strive for unanimity—even among the American republics—on all important problems. Pronounced differences of opinion regarding fundamental political and economic questions are natural and inevitable. Let us acknowledge that fact, and then formulate a program that aims at assuring the greatest good for the greatest number. The advantages of the inter-American system should be enjoyed only by those countries which contribute to its success. There should be fair protection of minority interests, but the existence of such a minority does not mean that the inter-American system is a failure. It merely proves that the system follows a normal pattern in human affairs. A broad common meeting-ground exists for the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Unanimous action will be possible in many cases; when it is not possible, however, the rule of the majority, especially of a well-informed and overwhelming majority, is fair and practicable. Democracy itself would cease to function if the principle of unanimity were applied to the processes of democracy.

The records of inter-American relations abound in resolutions and declarations passed by unanimous vote. These have a real value. They constitute a moral force in international relations, but they do not serve to meet the vital needs of international organization. What is the record with respect to treaties and conventions whose terms impose concrete obligations on the signatories?

The major inter-American treaties and conventions dealing with the prevention of conflicts, the

XXVI

CRIMES OF AGGRESSION AGAINST THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

WHEREAS:

American solidarity has developed to a degree where there exists a complete sense of continental responsibility for the defense of the juridical rights that are an integral part of the consciousness of the peoples of the Americas;

The territorial integrity or inviolability, the sovereignty or independence of any of the members of the American community should be regarded as juridical rights of the highest order, and in the event that such rights are jeopardized the American States should, in their individual decisions regarding foreign and domestic matters, adopt a common political conduct and follow a uniform juridical procedure, in order that they may cooperate with the country that is the victim of aggression, as the Governments of Uruguay and Chile have done through legislation enacted on November 19, 1942, and December 31, 1942, respectively;

The preservation of the peace of the Continent is inseparable from the territorial integrity and independence of each of the States members of the American community,

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

RESOLVES:

To recommend that the Governments of the American Republics classify as crimes in their domestic criminal law, any acts, whether individual or collective, that favor a non-American State at war against an American State that is the victim of aggression.

(Approved at the plenary session of
March 7, 1945)

rights and duties of states, the maintenance of peace, non-intervention, the prevention of controversies, conciliation, and arbitration have been ratified by from 14 to 19 of the 21 republics. Only one major convention, the Pan American Sanitary Convention, has been ratified by all of the republics. Over 100 inter-American treaties and conventions have been signed since 1890. Argentina, which holds the record for failure to ratify, has ratified among the principal agreements only the Anti-War Treaty of 1933 and the Pan American Sanitary Convention. Other treaties ratified by Argentina include several postal conventions: one

on international law, one on the status of naturalized citizens, two on radiocommunications, and one on European colonies and possessions in the Americas; but they do not include any of the major peace treaties referred to, except the Anti-War Treaty. Ratifications by other republics range upward from the Argentine low, but they prove conclusively that nothing like unanimity has been achieved in the basic issues of inter-American relations during half a century of experience. Why not face that fact openly and thus strengthen rather than weaken the inter-American system?

The problem of minorities is an old one, both in national and in international affairs. Emphasis usually is placed naturally upon the protection of minority interests. A majority has no moral justification for riding rough-shod over the rights of a minority. To safeguard the materially weak from unprincipled action by the materially powerful is essential; however, there is a tyranny of weakness as well as a tyranny of strength. If a powerful nation is in the right in a conflict with a weak nation, justice demands that the issue be met on the basis of the merits of the case and not on the basis of the relative strength of the two parties. Children in spite of being weak and helpless as compared with adults are not permitted because of that fact to play with fire before they start a conflagration nor are they permitted wantonly to destroy property or to abuse weaker playmates. The time has come to give more careful attention to the rights of majorities. If the world is to succeed in organizing itself on the democratic principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, minorities, in the very nature of things, must make more concessions than majorities.

To secure ratification by every one of the American republics of all of the principal inter-American treaties and conventions would probably be impossible. It would be undesirable to attempt to force a nation against its will to sign a treaty which it regarded as unjust or harmful. An overwhelming majority of ratifying nations, however, certainly is justified in exerting every proper influence to persuade a minority to act in general accord with the majority decision. Some concessions always will be made, but when it is essential for one side or the other to give way then it is the minority which should change its position.

Under the inter-American system a procedure could be developed to provide for majority action

to maintain peace and security. Such action would be based on the accepted procedure of consultation. A clause designed to help solve the problem might be included in all important inter-American treaties and conventions. Such a clause would provide that when a treaty or convention has been ratified by two-thirds of the American republics, which two-thirds also represent 40 percent or more of the total population of the 21 countries, then any action by a non-signatory American nation which constitutes a threat to peace and security and which is contrary to the terms of the treaty shall give rise to consultation among the signatory governments for the purpose of considering action to meet the situation.

The "two-thirds-40 percent" formula will be objected to as giving an undue influence to the United States. Here, again, a balance must be sought between sovereign equality and the will of the majority. The population of the United States exceeds the combined populations of the other 20 American republics. If a simple two-thirds rule were adopted, the 14 republics with the smallest populations could outvote the remaining 7. That is, about 12 percent of the total population of the American republics could exert a greater influence than the remaining 88 percent. There is no justice in that. The best solution seems to be to establish a dual system based on the number of countries and on their population. Under the suggested "two-thirds-40 percent" formula, two-thirds of the most populous American republics, exclusive of the United States, could meet the 40-percent requirement. The United States would not have an exclusive veto power in inter-American affairs.

Two other extremely important and controversial questions which must be decided are those relating to national sovereignty and to the intervention by some states in the internal or external affairs of other states. National interests are obviously the first consideration of any country. Bitter and costly experience has proved, however, that the national interests of any people are impossible of attainment unless they are adjusted to the equally valid national interests of other peoples. Unless all are willing to make concessions, there is no alternative except the rule of the strongest. The final settlement after a war almost invariably involves some concessions by both sides, regardless of who wins on the battlefield. We

eventually must learn to make the concessions in the first instance and thus avoid the wars. One universal concession must be a voluntary limitation upon absolute sovereignty.

Limitation of sovereignty does not affect the important question of *equal* sovereignty. The limitations must be the same for large and small nations, for strong and weak alike. Once certain limitations on sovereignty are voluntarily accepted by the great majority of peoples, it will be justifiable to insist that all nations observe those limitations. Even before the war emergency imposed limitations, some voluntary curtailment of national sovereignty had been made. The field of public health furnishes an example. If a given country fails to establish and maintain conditions and standards which afford adequate safeguards to public health in other countries, the international community takes a hand. The action is negative rather than positive, but it is effective. The offending country suffers serious disadvantages in its communications and contacts with the outside world until conditions are remedied. A similar procedure could be developed with respect to political, social, and economic affairs. Political, social, and economic ills are even more serious threats to humanity than are physical diseases. Their remedy involves a voluntary limitation upon absolute national sovereignty. With equal sovereignty as a basis, any minority, as a matter of self-preservation, will have to accept a standard of sovereignty considered fair by the majority.

The economic field furnishes striking evidence of the necessity to accept some limitation upon sovereignty. A blind following of purely national interests by most countries during the two decades from 1919 to 1939 resulted in the collapse of international trade, chaos in international finance, widespread unemployment, world crisis, and disastrous consequences for all national economies. Every nation wants and needs markets, foreign or domestic, for its products, whether these are raw materials or manufactures. This end cannot be achieved by arbitrary individual action. Adjustments of each national economy to the broader needs of world economy are essential in order that all peoples may enjoy a decent standard of living. A similar argument is even stronger in dealing with political problems.

There is implicit in several of the resolutions adopted at the Mexico City conference an accept-

ance of some limitation of national sovereignty in the interest of international welfare. Among these resolutions may be cited resolution VIII on Reciprocal Assistance and American Solidarity, XI, Declaration of Mexico, XX and XXI regarding economic controls and economic adjustment, XXVI on Crimes of Aggression Against the American Republics, XXVII on Free Access to Information, XXX on Establishment of a General International Organization, XXXIV regarding Abolition of the Recognition of De Facto Governments, XXXVIII entitled Defense and Preservation of Democracy in America, XL on the International Protection of the Essential Rights of Man, XLI on Racial Discrimination, LI entitled Economic Charter of the Americas, and LVIII, which is a Declaration of Social Principles of America.⁵ Chapter I, Purposes and Principles, of the text of the Charter of the United Nations also makes clear beyond any question of doubt that individual nations must give up a part of their freedom of action in order to comply with joint obligations toward the international community.

Equal but limited sovereignty is closely related to the question of the intervention by some states in the internal or external affairs of other states. The American republics have adopted the policy of non-intervention as one of the cardinal points in their international relations. The theory is excellent, but it is based upon the ideal that every state is going to act always in such a manner that the welfare of the American community of nations will not suffer thereby. Unfortunately, the theory is at variance with history and experience. If we study the history of international relations we must admit that there always has been intervention by some states in the internal or external affairs of other states. Furthermore, there seems to be slight ground for the hope that such intervention can or will be eliminated in the near future, even in the inter-American field, where there is less excuse for it than in most other parts of the

⁵ For text of resolutions see *Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace* (Pan American Union, 1945; Congress and Conference Series No. 47).

For article on economic aspects of the Mexico City conference by H. Gerald Smith, see *BULLETIN* of Apr. 8, 1945, p. 624; for a discussion of the recommendations dealing with social questions, see article by Marion Parks, *BULLETIN* of Apr. 22, 1945, p. 732; and for an interpretation of the resolutions dealing with the elimination of Axis influence in this hemisphere, see article by Thomas C. Mann, *BULLETIN* of May 20, 1945, p. 924.

world. A different approach to the problem would protect the progress that has been made toward its solution in the Western Hemisphere. There should be absolutely no unilateral intervention by any state in the internal or external affairs of the American republics. Neither should there be a failure to acknowledge the fact that intervention at times may be essential to the general welfare. The problem, then, involves guiding that necessary intervention into constructive and justifiable channels; bringing it about through multilateral action on the democratic principle of majority rule; and eliminating unilateral intervention (aggression) by armed force—especially armed force exercised by the strong against the weak.

The first concrete step to provide for multilateral intervention to meet threats or acts of aggression was taken with the adoption of resolution VIII, the Act of Chapultepec, at the Mexico City conference. Every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall be considered as an act of aggression against other states which sign the Act of Chapultepec. It is stated that invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression. It is further provided that in case acts of aggression occur or there may be reasons to believe that an aggression

is being prepared by any other state against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take. Sanctions ranging from the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions to the use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression are provided for in the act. The Act of Chapultepec is effective only during the present war; however, a provision is made by which the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect the instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times. Secretary of State Stettinius, with the approval of the President, announced that the United States would join with the other American republics in a conference to be held later this year for the purpose of negotiating a treaty that would establish on a permanent basis the principles of the Act of Chapultepec.

The essence of the security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations is multilateral action, by armed force if necessary, to maintain world peace.

The right of a nation to establish whatever type of government it desires must carry with it the corresponding obligation to accept the consequences of its action. One of the consequences may be absolute incompatibility with the kind of government and institutions preferred by the great majority of other nations. It is against all the teachings of history to assume that the influence of a given type of government can be restricted to purely internal affairs. The effect is bound to be felt in relations with other countries. If, as has happened all too frequently in the past, there is political or economic aggression against other states—various economic and trade controls, improper or subversive political activities in foreign countries, the threat of aggression, or direct attack—then the majority has a right and a duty to defend itself. Any other course is dangerously like the fatal and discredited policy of appeasement.

It is inconceivable that the great majority of the American peoples will permit the establishment in the Western Hemisphere of systems and practices that have wrought such havoc in the world. The doctrine of racial superiority, the theory of government by a dictatorial and aggressive minority which ignores individual rights

XXXIV

ABOLITION OF THE RECOGNITION OF DE FACTO GOVERNMENTS

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

RESOLVES:

That the Inter-American Juridical Committee study the project presented by the Delegation of Ecuador entitled "Draft Convention on Abolition of the Recognition of De Facto Governments," and render an opinion on the subject to the Governments of the American Republics, through the Pan American Union, for consideration at the Ninth International Conference of American States.

(Approved at the plenary session of
March 7, 1945)

and dignity and subordinates all else to a mythical "state", the formation of antagonistic blocs of nations, the balance-of-power system, vicious competition in armaments, the rule of force rather than law—these are things that we should combat with all our energy. We cannot afford to handicap ourselves in the fight by an undue emphasis upon national sovereignty and non-intervention. There can be no just cause for objection if the same standards of conduct are insisted upon for all countries, large and small, and if the objective always is that of the general welfare of the international community. The democracies of the world surely must have learned by now that if an issue is a choice between their system and the totalitarian system, they must be prepared to fight. Democratic countries also must make it clear to totalitarian governments everywhere that they intend to intervene by means of preventive measures in order that the latter will not be able to plunge the world into another maelstrom of war.

The solution to these problems in the Western Hemisphere has the great advantage of the progress already made by the American republics in working out their relations on a peaceful and co-operative basis. A difficult complication is that of a great disparity in political and economic power between the United States and any of the other American republics. That fact should be brought out into the open and faced honestly. Professor Frank Tannenbaum comments upon it clearly and intelligently in his article "An American Commonwealth of Nations", published in the July 1944 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. He points out that the democratic influence of the United States in Latin America is essentially revolutionary; that by our very presence and size whatever we do or say—even if we do or say nothing—has the effect of intervention. That places an especially heavy responsibility upon us. We must be honest with ourselves and honest with the other American republics. We have as much right as other countries, large or small, to consider our own national interests to the same extent that they consider theirs. But we should be conscientious in setting an example by considering world welfare as well as our own national interests.

The United States should not be deterred from exerting its great influence in favor of democracy and a decent organization of the world community just because the old cry of "Yankee imperialism" is raised. Our acts should and must refute

that charge, a charge that often is made in good faith but which also is exploited to the full by anti-democratic elements. The policies and measures advocated by the United States in inter-American affairs should be judged on their merits. It is both unfair and undemocratic to oppose them merely because they happen to be advanced by the most powerful member of the American nations. Our full weight should be thrown behind the movement to achieve real democracy, real political and economic security, real respect for human and individual dignity, real freedom of thought, speech and worship for all peoples. If we do not lead in the fight for these principles, who will?

Ten of the American republics occupy South America; three are island countries; Mexico, the five Central American states, and Panama bring the number to 20. The United States, with more than half of the total population of the 21 republics, is the 21st. Those who fear the undue influence of the United States in inter-American affairs, justly or unjustly, often claim that the Central American countries, Panama, and the island republics cannot afford, because of economic dependence, to go counter to the course pursued by the United States. Such a claim is, at most, only partially true. Even on this basis, the United States and the group of countries mentioned make a total of only 10, a minority of the 21. Mexico and the 10 South American nations remain. It was suggested in a previous paragraph in connection with inter-American treaties that action might be based upon a two-thirds majority representing also at least 40 percent of the total population of the 21 republics. That would mean that any action advocated by the United States and by the 9 countries said to follow its lead also would have to be approved by 4 of the remaining 11 countries. Such a safeguard against undue influence of the United States should be an adequate one.

IV

ONE OF THE BEST WAYS to combat post-war let-down, cynicism, and despair will be to inspire the same unity and cooperation in winning the peace that is contributing so much to victory in the war. The American republics are in a particularly favorable situation to make a major contribution. They have suffered much less than other parts of the world. They are not faced by the terrific drain for reconstruction that will burden Europe

and Asia. They have a long and successful record of international cooperation. The choices for the world are few. There must be an international organization that can and will assure peace and security. Otherwise there will be a world dictatorship of some kind, or international anarchy. The future depends in no small degree upon how wisely and how strongly the Western Hemisphere exerts its influence in world affairs. The most we may hope for as the result of intelligent, vigorous, and generous effort is that our successes will outweigh our failures. That would be a great accomplishment. Success will be measured in terms of centuries, not in terms of years. This generation, or any generation, must be content to make a positive contribution to the progress and evolution of the human race and civilization. We must answer to our consciences, to future generations, and to our God if we fail to make that contribution.

Maintenance of peace is the most important immediate problem. It is the major task of the new world Organization, and it has been one of the principal considerations in the inter-American system during many years. Security of all nations against aggression and relief from the crushing and unproductive expenditures for armament are essentials. The American republics, which took a further step in agreeing upon the Act of Chapultepec at the Mexico City conference, can contribute the benefit of their experience. There have been wars and the use of armed force among the American nations. Their peace system has not been entirely successful, but it has been more effective than in most of the other parts of the world. The elaborate and complicated nature of the inter-American peace structure detracts from its usefulness. This fact is recognized in resolution XXXIX of the Mexico City conference, which, in referring to the inter-American peace system, observes that "simplification of the mechanism of codification is not only desirable but necessary". The resolution provides for the immediate preparation of a draft instrument which will coordinate the various continental instruments for the prevention and pacific solution of controversies.

The will to peace and the determination to settle international differences without recourse to force are what really count. Practically all of the American republics are on record in favor of these principles. The question of hemisphere defense

will have to be studied by the American republics until the world security Organization is functioning. The next step probably will be the negotiation of the inter-American treaty to place the provisions of the Act of Chapultepec on a permanent basis. However, the American republics do not face a serious situation in providing for defense against possible attack from a neighboring country—not if their inter-American declarations and commitments have been made in good faith.

Hemisphere defense could well be dealt with in the first instance by the Inter-American Defense Board, which was created during the war. Resolution IX of the Mexico City conference includes the Inter-American Defense Board among a group of organs that shall continue to carry on their functions until the Ninth International Conference of American States takes further action with respect to these organs. The Defense Board could prepare technical plans and recommendations regarding the relative strengths of the land, naval, and air forces of the 21 republics and regarding the joint action of those forces for hemisphere defense. Agreement will not be easy. There will have to be a real acceptance of the principle, implicit in inter-American treaties and declarations, that armaments in the Western Hemisphere are not intended for use against an American nation. Success in reaching an agreement would make possible a general reduction in armaments and would be an inspiring example and valuable contribution to the related world problem.

The American republics also can do much to promote understanding and friendship among the peoples of the world, which is even more important than cooperation among governments. Government action has no permanent value unless it is supported by public opinion. The experience of the Americas in a great variety of cooperative enterprises should be helpful in working out the post-war international Organization.

Economic problems can be given only brief mention in an article of limited scope. Economic problems are not, however, of minor importance. They require the best ability that we can devote to them, a spirit of tolerance, and a genuine effort to place the welfare of the majority above the pretensions of powerful special interests. Sharp lines cannot be drawn between problems in the political, social, and economic fields. They are so inter-related that they must be treated simultaneously

XXXVIII

DEFENSE AND PRESERVATION OF DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

RESOLVES:

That the Inter-American Juridical Committee study the project presented by the Delegation of Guatemala entitled "Defense and Preservation of Democracy in America Against the Possible Establishment of Anti-Democratic Regimes in the Continent," and that it render an opinion thereon for submission to the Governments of the American Republics, through the Pan American Union, for consideration at the Ninth International Conference of American States.

(Approved at the plenary session of
March 7, 1945)

and as parts of the whole pattern of our civilization.

Many of the principal resolutions adopted at the Mexico City conference reflect the preoccupation of the American republics with economic questions. An Inter-American Economic Conference is to be held in Washington during November of this year in order to give further study to the situation. The United States should extend all possible assistance to the other American republics in the work of establishing all of our national economies on a sound basis. This participation should not suggest careless extravagance or a Santa Claus role for the United States. The peoples of the Americas do not want that. They are proud and they have ability and are industrious. They need, above all, facilities which will enable them to help themselves. They need access to world markets on equal terms with other countries; the investment of foreign capital on fair terms to assist in the sound development of national resources; technical aid and advice. It is to the advantage of the industry, agriculture, and export trade of the United States to encourage sound industrialization in the other American republics. Increased industrialization and higher standards of living in any country make that country a better market for imported products.

The other American republics must do their share to put their economic houses in order. Hon-

est and efficient management of fiscal affairs is a task for which each government must be responsible. Any attempt to return to the pre-war system of restraints and controls and national self-sufficiency would spell disaster. Capital from the United States should not be made available for projects which are economically unsound or which would require permanent or unduly large protection by means of tariffs or other government subsidies. Investment of foreign and local capital in cooperative enterprises would tend to assure fair and equal treatment for both foreign and national interests. The policy of the United States with respect to investments in the other American republics might be marked by constructive conservatism and by an effort to strengthen broad national economies rather than powerful special interests. These measures, together with economic and trade policies on the part of the United States designed to help other countries sell enough to pay for their essential imports, should go far toward laying sound economic foundations.

V

THERE ARE THREE ASPECTS of international relations: that of *content*, involving the principles upon which peoples and governments base their relations, with the objective sought, with the essential reconciliation of the interests and desires of one people with those of other peoples; that of *form*, involving the methods by which it is sought to present and to make effective the content of international relations; and that of *timing*, involving the decisions about the most favorable opportunity to bring a given proposal before the community of nations or to the attention of one or more of them, about the relative emphasis to be placed upon diverse problems during any given period, and about the amount of influence which shall be brought to bear in the effort to obtain favorable action.

Broad principles, general objectives, and the necessary compromises with respect to conflicting interests are, of course, the heart of international relations. Form and timing do exert an important influence on events. The wrong way of doing a right thing may lead to delay, to a serious weakening in effect, or even to postponement of the desired result. Faulty timing will create similar difficulties and will prejudice immediate success or a full measure of progress. It is the heart of

this problem, however, upon which we must concentrate above all else and at all times.

Many influences will tend to divert attention and energy from these central and vital problems. When the war ends, hundreds of millions of men and women will need respite from their frightful ordeal. They should have it. They will not be ready immediately to take up the fight for the general welfare of the human race which must be waged against powerful minority and selfish interests. They naturally will have a first desire for peacetime and permanent employment, for the food and clothing and shelter which they have done without, for comfort and leisure and recreation, for all of the happier parts of life which were swept away in the flood of barbaric savagery turned loose upon the world by the self-appointed "superior" races in their mad quest for world domination. Those of us who have been spared the nightmare that descended upon the majority of the human race therefore must assume the responsibility for starting the work of reconstruction and for carrying it on until the majority is restored to physical, mental, and spiritual health and again can be rallied to assist in the general effort.

Passions and bitterness will be deep after the war. It cannot be otherwise. If these natural feelings are not dealt with on a basis of understanding, sympathy, and intelligence, this generation may not be able to start repairing the tremendous damage which civilization has undergone and to begin the laying of sounder foundations for the future. It will not be easy to administer the just and severe punishment which must fall upon those who are guilty of the horrible crimes of recent years against humanity and, at the same time, to avoid the excesses which outraged peoples quite naturally will want to commit against their former criminal assailants. In spite of a desire, which has substantial justification, to close one's eyes and to allow such excesses to run their course, it will be to the advantage of the international community to visit upon the guilty the full weight of justice and penalty rather than the unspeakable atrocities which they perpetrated and for which full measure of retribution must be made.

Strong minority groups are ready to take every advantage of circumstances in order to advance their own selfish interests at the expense of the general welfare. They will not want to have effort directed toward basic problems and the remedies

for fundamental ills in our body politic. They will urge a "realistic" approach to world reorganization, but it is not realism that they want. They want more of the anodyne of the "good old days", of the false assumption that men and women desire only a return to the safe and simple and familiar things of life. Our hope lies in the new future, not in the old past. The safe and simple and familiar things of life have been crippled or destroyed during the past decade. There can be no return to something that has ceased to exist. We must reconstruct and at the same time adopt much better and stronger methods to protect what we rebuild. The new edifice will differ in design from the old, even though the same materials and the same site are used. There will be a reallocation of quarters in this new edifice of the human race. The minority groups are concerned primarily with handsome and comfortable quarters for themselves rather than with sound construction and adequate accommodations for all.

The period between the two world wars was marked by a dangerous weakening of the structure of the international community, which almost resulted in complete collapse. The great democracies failed to assume responsibility for resolutely facing the political problems that lead to wars. Isolationism and exaggerated nationalism brought civilization close to destruction. Now we must give constant and intelligent attention to the basic problems. Economic and financial questions are important, but their solution will not assure world peace. Much more is necessary. Economic and financial considerations, business as usual, certainly do not account for China's heroic fight against Japanese aggression during 8 years, nor for the desperate resistance of the European undergrounds in occupied countries, nor for our own determination that the only answer to Germany and Japan must be unconditional surrender.

Powerful forces still exist such as the desire for freedom, even when freedom may mean fewer material advantages; for the individual liberties of thought and speech and religion; for self-government, even if that means slower material progress and less efficient government than that exercised from outside; and for the opportunity for human beings to develop as individuals rather than to exist as robots who are regimented and controlled by a minority group setting itself up as the "state".

We have ideals and principles and institutions—a way of life—in the United States that mean much more than our prosperity and high standard of living. We are prone to take these things for granted until they are threatened, as they have been since this war began. Then we realize how deeply rooted they are in our lives and in our hearts. Our blessings in natural resources and wealth are great, but they mean little unless we utilize them to safeguard the far greater blessings of the liberties for which we have planned and worked and died. We should not forget these things when we take part in world reorganization. We can make a contribution far more valuable than money and arms. The United States should bring to the work of international relations an insistence upon morality as opposed to expediency, a steadfast devotion to principles instead of evasive opportunism, a determination to support the democratic thesis of the greatest good for the majority against the pressure of special interests, and an acceptance of joint responsibility to seek fair and practicable solutions for basic problems rather than temporary palliatives. Only so can we approach the better world we hope for. A great leader promised his people only blood, sweat, toil, and tears. That challenge was met. The necessity to give of our blood may lighten the burden before long but the decent organization of the world will call for toil with sweat and tears during our time and long after.

The human race is spread over the face of the earth, living under widely differing geographic and climatic conditions. Suppose that we all were to attempt to travel from our places of abode to a fixed destination. Some of us live near the great arteries of transportation. We could travel by sea, by air, by rail, by highway. Others are isolated in difficult country. These people might have to cut paths through jungles to reach a highway, travel by small boat or by mule or on foot. Some would have ample means for the journey and could travel comfortably; others would suffer many privations. The distances to the destination would vary between the widest extremes. An analogy might be drawn in the case of the goal we seek in the evolution of our civilization. Let us say that it is a Utopian goal—a condition of spiritual, mental, and physical well-being for every member of the human race. There would be the

same differences in situation facing various races, nations, and groups in this hypothetical journey. Distances would range from long to astronomical figures; facilities would vary from practically nothing to some fairly effective ones; obstacles in the way would not be too serious in some cases, but they would be almost insurmountable in others. The important things are to set the proper course, to move toward the goal, and to help the other fellow get there. Attractive by-paths will offer easier travel, but they could lead to a dead-end or over a precipice. It may be necessary to turn back at times in order to advance by another route, but the general direction must not be lost. Those who have the easier journey are obligated to help the less fortunate. It may only be necessary to aid them to reach a better road from an isolated position, or to help chart the course for those who do not know the way; but in some cases it will be essential to cut the first paths, to give a lift to those who are unable to travel under their own power. A fine dream, perhaps, but what remains of the history of the human race if dreams are ignored?

Food-Production Agreement

Venezuela

The American Embassy at Caracas transmitted to the Department with a despatch dated May 16, 1945 the texts of notes exchanged at Caracas May 14, 1945 extending for one year, with certain modifications, the food-production agreement between the United States and Venezuela which was signed May 14, 1943¹ and extended May 13, 1944.²

Exchange of Ratifications of Treaty of Friendship

China-Costa Rica

The American Ambassador at San José, in a communication dated June 15, 1945, informed the Acting Secretary of State of the exchange of ratifications at San José on that date of the treaty of friendship between Costa Rica and China which was signed May 5, 1944.³

¹ BULLETIN of June 5, 1943, p. 501; Executive Agreement Series 333.

² BULLETIN of Nov. 26, 1944, p. 642.

³ BULLETIN of Aug. 27, 1944, p. 220.

Sugar Shipments to Spain

On July 11, 1945, in lieu of his press and radio news conference, Acting Secretary Grew commented on the reports concerning shipments of sugar to Spain by the United States. Mr. Grew stated that no sugar was being shipped from the United States to Spain, but that in accordance with a joint British-American supply agreement Spain was to receive 30,000 tons of sugar during the first half of 1945, adding that this sugar is being supplied from British sources in the Caribbean and is being transported on Spanish ships. The Acting Secretary disclosed that Spain in return had agreed not to enter the world sugar market for any other sugar. Mr. Grew said that he understood that this quantity of sugar was not only below Spanish requirements but was also 40 percent less than Spain received under similar arrangements in the second six months of last year.

Inter-American Conventions

Peru

The Director General of the Pan American Union has informed the Secretary of State by a note dated June 27, 1945 that the Ambassador of Peru deposited with the Pan American Union on June 21 the instruments of ratification by the Government of Peru of the conventions regarding Status of Aliens, Asylum, Consular Agents, Pan American Union, Treaties, and Rights and Duties of States in the Event of Civil Strife, which were signed at the Sixth International Conference of American States held in Habana in 1928. The instrument of ratification of the Convention on the Status of Aliens is dated April 25, 1945 and the other instruments of ratification are dated April 9, 1945.

Visit of Venezuelan Dentist

[Released to the press July 10]

Dr. Foción Febres Cordero, professor of dental pathology in the Central University of Venezuela at Caracas, will visit a number of colleges of dentistry in the United States during the next four months. Dr. Febres Cordero, who is a guest of

the Department of State, is making a special study of the organization and functioning of dental schools in this country and of teaching methods along the line of his own specialty, dental pathology. He is the author of a plan recently put into effect for the reorganization of the School of Dentistry of the University at Caracas, on whose faculty he has served for the past eight years. His itinerary will include schools at Washington, New York, Boston, Chicago, and Ann Arbor.

Cooperative Education

El Salvador

The American Embassy at San Salvador transmitted to the Department, with a despatch dated June 18, the texts of an exchange of notes signed June 9, 1945 at San Salvador by the American Ambassador and the Salvadoran Minister for Foreign Affairs in which the Governments of the United States and El Salvador agreed upon a cooperative education program. The agreement provides that each Government will contribute \$80,000, the contribution of the United States to be made through the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., an agency of the Office of Inter-American Affairs. The agreement, which became effective on the date of signing, will remain in force for three years.

THE DEPARTMENT

International Information Division¹

Purpose. This order is issued to authorize the International Information Division of the Office of Public Affairs to attest the educational character of sound-recordings.

1 *Amendment to Departmental Order 1301.* Departmental Order 1301 of December 20, 1944, section XV, paragraph 4 (1), is hereby amended to read "The official attestation of the international educational character of documentary films and sound-recordings".

2 *Effective date.* This order shall be effective as of the date of issue.

JOSEPH C. GREW
Acting Secretary of State

¹ Departmental Order 1301-A, dated and effective July 11, 1945.

Appointment of Officers

Edwin M. Martin as Adviser on Far East Economic Affairs in the office of the Assistant Secretary in charge of economic affairs, effective May 7, 1945.

THE CONGRESS

Foreign Claims Act Made Applicable to the Philippine Islands. H. Rept. 859, 79th Cong., to accompany H. R. 3111. 7 pp. [Favorable report.]

Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function? 279 Questions and Answers, a comprehensive story of the history and functions of our American Government interestingly and accurately portrayed. Questions and Answers Relative to our American Government. H. Doc. 228, 79th Cong. ii, 62 pp.

Investigation of the National Defense Program. Additional Report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, pursuant to S. Res. 71 (77th Congress; S. Res. 6, 78th Congress, and S. Res. 55, 79th Congress), Resolutions authorizing and directing an investigation of the national defense program. Investigations Overseas. S. Rept. 110, Part 2, 79th Cong. iii, 35 pp.

Participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Report From the Committee on Banking and Currency to accompany H.R. 3314, an act to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. S. Rept. 452, 79th Cong. ii, 30 pp.

The Charter of the United Nations. Remarks of Hon. Tom Connally, Senator from the State of Texas, in the Senate of the United States, June 28, 1945, relative to the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. S. Doc. 58, 79th Cong. ii, 12 pp.

Key to the Year of Decisions of Cases in the United States Supreme Court, the Opinions of the Attorneys General and Other Legal Reports. Devised and arranged by I. J. Lowe, Member of the Legal Staff, United States Department of Agriculture. S. Doc. 73, 79th Cong. iii, 16 pp.

Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill for 1945: Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on H. R. 3579, an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years

ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. ii, 137 pp. [Department of State, pp. 59-68.]

An Act To amend the joint resolutions of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute." Approved July 2, 1945. H. R. 688, Public Law 111, 79th Cong. 1 p.

An Act To extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. Approved July 5, 1945. H. R. 3240, Public Law 130, 79th Cong. 1 p.

An Act To amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government." Approved July 6, 1945. H. R. 44, Public Law 133, 79th Cong. 1 p.

To reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944. Approved July 6, 1945. H. R. 2685, Private Law 142, 79th Cong. 1 p.

ADVERTISEMENT

Official Daily Service:



• The *Federal Register* presents the only official publication of the text of Federal regulations and notices restricting or expanding commercial operations.

• All Federal agencies are required by law to submit their documents of general applicability and legal effect to the *Federal Register* for daily publication.

A sample copy and additional information on request to the Federal Register, National Archives, Washington 25, D. C.

\$15 a year • \$1.50 a month

Order from

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON 25, D. C.